



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1997

No. 36

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable CHARLES H. TAYLOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Your word has told us, O God, that You know us individually and by the power of Your creative spirit, You support us all the day long. We place before You our petitions asking that You would hear our prayers and give peace to any troubled soul. We pray specially for healing for those who are ill, for strength for those who are weak, for encouragement for those who face anxiety or fear and for every person we pray for the gift of hope in all the days to come. Grateful for all Your blessings, O God, we offer these words of petition and thanksgiving. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT]

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHABOT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

MEXICO'S PRESIDENT ZEDILLO IS WRONG ON DECERTIFICATION

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, Mexico's President Ernesto Zedillo made some very troubling comments last week following the House vote to decertify his country for its miserable performance in the war against drugs. President Zedillo said, "This is where we draw the line." He had it wrong. This is where we draw the line. Mr. Zedillo went on to say that Mexico's sovereignty and dignity as a nation are not negotiable.

I would point out to Mr. Zedillo that the dignity of his nation was not diminished by the House action last week, but by the failure of his own government to responsibly fight against the scourge of narcotics traffic through Mexico.

Blocks from this Nation's Capitol, one can see the horror of drug abuse. Whether we are talking about cocaine, marijuana, or methamphetamine, there is a pretty good chance it came to this city and other American cities like my community, Cincinnati, from Mexico. Sadly, the demand is here, and as Americans we have an obligation to

do something about the demand, but as a neighbor, Mexico has an obligation to become an equal partner in that battle.

Up to now they have failed. That is why this body finally drew the line. It is about time.

APPLYING NEW THINKING TO THE CLEAN AIR DEBATE

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the clean air debate cannot be reduced to a simple cost-benefit analysis that ignores the effect of pollution on human health and separates the economic from the human.

We should not face the 21st century locked into the old paradigm that gives us the false choice between jobs and clean air. Being proenvironment should not mean one is antibusiness. It is time for new thinking on the issue of pollution, thinking that promotes both economic growth and human health and supports environmental regulations that encourage efficiency and non-pollution.

Nineteenth century thinking focused on pollution control, at the end of the tailpipe or at the end of the chimney. Such an approach requires a great deal of energy and money and is generally insufficient to protect the environment. New thinking looks at pollution prevention, inventing ways to stop pollution from being created. New thinking views pollution as resources that are distributed in the wrong place. Wasted resources mean lost profits. Environmental protection can be equated with fiscal conservatism.

Application of more enlightened environmental management processes can increase profits. Such an approach will require that government and industry leaders work together to further the development of new communities;

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H1113